

REMARKS

In the August 28, 2007 Office Action, claims 1-16 stand rejected in view of prior art. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

***Status of Claims and Amendments***

In response to the August 28, 2007 Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, and 13 to clarify them. Further, Applicants have amended the specification and claims 2-5, 8-11, and 13 to correct form, typographical and/or grammatical errors, and have added claims 17-19. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the examination of this application. Thus, claims 1-19 are pending, with claims 1, 7, and 13 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

***Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

In item 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 13-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicants' admitted prior art in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,259,468 (Higuchi). In item 3 of the Office Action, claims 3, 6, 9, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicants' admitted prior art and Higuchi, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0228639 (Badovinac et al.). In item 4 of the Office Action, claims 3 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicants' admitted prior art and Higuchi, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,885,829 (Braun et al.). In response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, and 13 to clarify them.

Specifically, claims 1, 7, and 13 now recite that the abnormalities are different from an amount of paper in the paper supply unit. It is stated on page 3 of the Office Action, and Applicants agree, that the disclosed prior art does not teach that the abnormality detection

unit displays with emphasis the location of the paper supply unit or paper discharge unit in which an abnormality was detected on the image of the image forming device. Thus, the Office Action relies on Higuchi to show this feature. The Office Action references Figures 6 and 7 of Higuchi to show a detected abnormality. In contrast to independent claims 1, 7, and 13 of the present application, Applicant respectfully asserts that Higuchi does not display an abnormality but that paper is or is not present.

Applicants respectfully assert that according to MPEP §2111.01(I) terms must be given their plain meaning unless such meaning is inconsistent with the specification. Applicants respectfully assert that the plain meaning of “abnormality” would not include being out of paper because exhausting the paper supply is a routine and regular occurrence that is a matter of supply, whereas an abnormality is an undesirable event that interrupts or adversely affects operation. Further, Applicants respectfully assert that according to MPEP §2111.01(IV) applicant may be his own lexicographer. Applicants respectfully assert that in this specification the definition given to “abnormal” specifically excludes detection of paper supply (see at least paragraphs [0021] and [0041] of the written disclosure). Thus, since both the plain meaning and the definition employed in specification of the present application do not include being out of paper, Applicants respectfully assert that Higuchi does not disclose displaying an abnormality as recited in claims 1, 7, and 13 of the present application. Further, Applicants respectfully assert that the aforementioned amendments to claims 1, 7, and 13 clarify this.

Applicants respectfully assert that Badovinac et al. are cited to show an out of paper determining unit and out of paper display unit that is different from the representation used to display the abnormality. However, Applicants respectfully assert that Badovinac et al. disclose the use of smiley faces and other similar icons and fail to disclose or to suggest

displaying an abnormality on the image of the image forming device as claimed. Further, Applicants respectfully assert that Braun et al. are cited to show an abnormality management device connected to an image forming device as well as a network, wherein the operation and error states of individual assembly groups can be displayed via a colored identification so that operating personnel can quickly and precisely select a modular unit whose default values and operating states should be presented and checked, and fails to overcome the deficiencies of Higuchi.

Applicants respectfully assert that this arrangement is not disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record. It is well settled in U.S. patent law that the mere fact that the prior art can be modified does not make the modification obvious, unless the prior art suggests the desirability of the modification. Accordingly, the prior art of record lacks any suggestion or expectation of success for combining the patents to create the Applicants' unique arrangement of an abnormality management device.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn in view of the above comments.

***New Claims 17 and 18***

Applicants have added new claims 17 and 18, which depend on independent claim 1. Applicants believe that these claims are allowable for the aforementioned reasons claim 1 is allowable. Further, Applicants believe that these claims are further allowable because they contain additional limitations.

Examination and consideration are respectfully requested.

\* \* \*

Appl. No. 10/707,105  
Amendment dated November 27, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of August 28, 2007

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-18 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/David L. Tarnoff/  
David L. Tanoff  
Reg. No. 32,383

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP  
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202)-293-0444  
Dated: 11/27/2007

S:\11-NOV07-YS\KM-US030558 Amendment Reviced by YS.doc